

1646  
S

*10092*

**Expedited Procedure under 37 CFR 1.116**  
**Group Art Unit 1646**



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: WAX, Martin B. et al. Examiner: O'HARA, E.  
Serial No.: 09/591,561 Group Art Unit: 1646  
Filed: June 13, 2000  
Title: METHODS FOR TREATING GLAUCOMA

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Box: AF

**COMMUNICATION IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Sir:

This Communication is filed in response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2003, issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office finally rejecting the claims in connection with the above-identified Application. A response to the Office Action is due September 2, 2003. Applicants are concurrently filing a Petition for One-Month-Extension of Time. Therefore, a response is due October 2, 2003. Accordingly, this Communication is being timely filed.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1, 2, 11-14, 16 and 17 are under examination. Claims 3-10 and 15 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

**OATH & DECLARATION**

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the Oath or Declaration is defective. The Examiner asserted that on page 2 of the Amendment filed March 10, 2003, Applicants stated that they are forwarding a Supplemental Oath and Declaration, claiming benefit under 35 USC 120 to Application Serial No. 09/500,023. According to the Examiner, the

APPLICANTS: WAX, Martin B. et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 09/591,561  
FILED: June 13, 2000  
Page 2

Supplemental Oath and Declaration has not been received and therefore the objection is maintained.

In response, Applicants point out that a Supplemental Oath and Declaration claiming the benefit under 35 USC 120 to Application Serial No. 09/500,023 was submitted to the United States Patent and Trademarks Office on April 30, 2003. Applicants attach herewith as Appendix A, a copy of the Supplemental Oath & Declaration filed on March 10, 2003 within the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and a copy of the postcard stamped by the USPTO (Appendix B). Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.


#### DOUBLE PATENTING

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Claims 1, 2, 11, 16 and 17, are allegedly rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, and 6 of United States Patent No. 6,531,128.

In response, without conceding the correctness of the Examiner's position, Applicants attach herewith, as Appendix C, a Terminal Disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the provisional rejection. In view of the above amendments and remarks it is submitted that the Application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the examiner to withdraw the rejections of the claims. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 05-0649.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark S. Cohen  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 42,425

Dated: October 1, 2003

Eitan, Pearl, Latzer & Cohen Zedek, LLP.  
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001  
New York, New York 10020  
Tel: (212) 632-3480  
Fax: (212) 632-3490